

Claims

On Page 10, Line 2, insert - - 1) - - at the start of the sentence.

On Page 10, Line 4, delete "1) A" and substitute - - a - -.

In Claim 1, Line 9, "in such a matter" should be deleted and substituted with - - in such a manner - -.

In Claim 1, Line 8, "an external surface" should be deleted and substituted with - - a said exterior surface - -.

In Claim 2, Line 2, "as is claim 1" should be deleted and substituted with - - as in claim 1 - -.

In Claim 2, Line 2, "wherein the highly damped layer is" should be deleted and substituted with - - wherein at least one of the highly damped layers is - -.

In Claim 3, Line 2, "as is claim 1" should be deleted and substituted with - - as in claim 1 - -.

In Claim 3, Line 2, "wherein the low outgassing layer is" should be deleted and substituted with - - wherein at least one of the low outgassing layers is - -.

In Claim 3, Line 3, "fluorinated polymer" should be deleted and substituted with - - fluorocarbon elastomer - -.

Delete Claim 4.

Delete Claim 5.

35 USC § 102 Rejection

Line Item 6

Johnson et al. does not show a multiple layer damper that is similar to the present invention. The present invention has an additional element that Johnson does not, namely the fact that the present invention uses a dampening material as an external layer and Johnson strictly uses a non dampening tack free external film as an external layer. Although in figure 10c of the Johnson patent there are two dampers layers 448 and 450 internally, the outer layer 446 is not a damper but an external film designed specifically to provide for a tack free surface to the overall damper. Consequently, the Johnson design is not similar to the present invention as Johnson does not use a dampening device, like a fluorocarbon elastomer such as Viton, to encapsulate the high outgassing dampers, but uses instead a non dampening film. Nowhere in the 30 columns of the